



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,545	02/15/2007	Hannu Pirila	944-003.183-1	8661
4955	7590	07/26/2010	EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			JAMA, ISAIAK R	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2617		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/26/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/563,545	Applicant(s) PIRILA ET AL.
	Examiner ISAAK R. JAMA	Art Unit 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2010.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-12,14,15 and 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-12,14,15 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 9 as it stands in its latest amended form recites “.....service request signalling that is unsupported by the network device operating in the first mode in a transparent container, to the other network device for allowing.....”. The underlined lacks any explanation in the Applicant's disclosure, and, as such; the Examiner is unable to interpret what the Applicant truly means by a transparent container. Appropriate correction is required.

Status of Claims

2. Claim 9 is amended.
3. Claims 2, 7, 13 and 16 are cancelled.
4. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 14, 15 and 17-22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 04/19/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited references (mainly Torabi) fails to disclose or suggest sending service request signalling to a network device operating in a first mode for requesting a service in at least one of various modes supported by the multimode terminal, said service being unsupported by the multimode terminal in the first mode. In addition, the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest receiving the requested service from another network device supporting a second mode as a result of

a handover from the network device to the other network device and that there is no handover, since the visited network merely receives the requested service from the home network. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's assertion. Torabi teaches a terminal that transmit a service request to a network device (i.e. the visited network infrastructure), and that when the visited network infrastructure that it cannot facilitate the requested service, the visited network send an inquiry to the subscriber's home network or supporting network depending upon the residency of the service (meaning where the requested service type maybe located, the home network or some other network). In addition, Torabi teaches that the supporting network processes the received request by determining whether the service request can be implemented in one of the service providing entities, if so, the data contained in the received message is used by the identified service to provide the service (i.e. the implication is that the requested service will be supplied by a different entity determined by the home network, and that is handing over the user to the entity that is able to supply the request). And that the secondary reference is geared towards a multimode terminal which the primary reference is silent. Therefore, the earlier rejection to the claims still stands.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 14, 15 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application Number 1 076 463 A2 (Torabi) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,748,246 (Khullar).

8. Regarding claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 20-22, Torabi teaches a method of operating in a network device which is a component of a multimode communication system and which is operable to serve a multimode terminal in a first mode, the method comprising: receiving service request signaling from the multimode terminal for requesting a service in at least one of various modes supported by the multimode terminal: said service being unsupported by the network device or by the multimode terminal in the first mode **[Column 6, lines 13-14; i.e. upon receiving a request from the user for a service unavailable at the visited network]**, and handing over the multimode terminal to another network device supporting a second mode and the requested service **[Column 6, lines 14-17; i.e. the visited network send an inquiry to the subscriber's home network or supporting network depending upon the residency of the service]** in order to establish the service in the second mode for the multimode terminal to receive the requested service from the other network device in the second mode, the requested service being supported by the multimode terminal in the second mode **[Column 6, the supporting network processes the received request by determining whether the service request can be implemented in one of the service providing entities, if so, the data contained in the received message is used by the identified service to provide the service]**. But Torabi does not specifically teach that the terminal is a multimode terminal or the services are in

different modes. Khullar teaches a method and apparatus for selecting an access technology in a multi-mode terminal [Title], whereby a multi-mode terminal [Figure 3] with three access technologies (i.e. modes), such as GSM, W-CDMA and Edge-Compact, and that if a network connection can be maintained using W-CDMA at the radiated power level RPL B, and using EDGE Compact at the radiated power level RPL C, the multimode terminal would select W-CDMA as the optimal AT (access technology) [Column 5, lines 10-13]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the multimode terminal and method of Khullar into the network system of Torabi in order to facilitate user requests in different access systems.

9. Regarding claims 3, 8, 14, 17 and 19, Torabi further teaches a method, system and apparatus where that the network device is using service request signaling messages that as such are used for services supported in the first mode, but using signaling parameter code points indicating a specific service that is not supported by the network device or by the multimode terminal in the first mode [Column 4, lines 13-17; i.e. the mobile subscriber unit transitions from one network to a new serving network, and discovers that this network cannot support the services for which the mobile subscriber unit has subscribed] but the specific service being supported by another system operating in the second mode [Column 5, lines 44-50; i.e. the supporting network is optionally equipped with the full set of service providing functional entities. This enables the supporting network to implement any feature

that is desired and subscribed by a subscriber, and make it available at a mobile communication unit roaming outside its home network].

10. Regarding claims 4, 5, 10 and 11, Khullar further teaches a method wherein the service request signaling is triggered by a multimode terminal originated service establishment request [Column 3, lines 48-55; i.e. a first multi-mode terminal, e.g., a mobile station (MS), is communicating with a second multi-mode terminal, e.g., one or more base stations (BS), within a communicating network. Both the MS and the BS are capable of transmitting and receiving information within the network using various AT links, e.g., W-CDMA, GSM, and EDGE Compact].

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISAAK R. JAMA whose telephone number is (571)270-5887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; 4-10.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester G. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/IRJ/

/LESTER KINCAID/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617